

IT IS A PLEASURE for me to be here with you this evening. I want to talk with you about the Central Intelligence Agency and the intelligence community and to share with you my perceptions and some of my experiences since I became Director of Central Intelligence.

I must confess that when I was off in China, the whole intelligence community and the welter of charges and allegations about it seemed very remote and unreal to me. Many of you have heard and read so much conflicting information about intelligence that you must wonder just what it all means.

Let me say first that I have learned that the intelligence community is one of the biggest assets we have in defending America's security. The community itself is diverse, and its range of talents and capabilities is absolutely unique.

Many of you think of intelligence and perhaps think only of the CIA and James Bond spy adventures. Well, that is a tiny part of our business. Most of the Agency's work is the far less exciting but equally important task of gathering information, sifting facts and attempting to develop an accurate picture of events and trends abroad.

Others of you may think of intelligence only in connection with the excesses of the past. Indeed, there were some mistakes and some bad judgments, but there were also a lot of charges made that weren't true. The mistakes were rooted out and stopped by the intelligence community itself well before they were publicly revealed. And I can assure you that we are taking every possible precaution to ensure that such abuses never occur again.

I said that the intelligence community is truly a national asset. Let me give you an example of one of its activities that may be of particular interest to this group: technical intelligence collection.

The main mission of foreign intelligence is to produce quality intelligence for the use of our policymakers so that they can determine policies with the best possible information and judgment we can give them. (I should add we are not in the policy business.) Obviously, producing quality intelligence depends upon collecting quality intelligence to support and feed the analytical process.

Over the past 10 to 15 years, the collection of this kind of information has been transformed. Human sources—spies, if you will—remain important and in many cases essential, but they are increasingly hard to come by. We had to find new ways to collect information to meet the needs of our increasingly technical problems.

In response to these needs, an activity known as technical collection has evolved. This has perhaps had



"I believe that one of my principal tasks as Director of Central Intelligence is to restore the faith of the American people in their intelligence service. This we can do by operating fully within the guidelines established. We must not and will not violate the laws of this country."

Banquet Address

STAT

**by The Honorable George Bush
Director, Central Intelligence Agency**

its greatest impact on our ability to solve key military intelligence problems such as determining the characteristics and deployment of weapon systems—systems that are themselves based on advancing and sophisticated technology.

A most dramatic example of a system to emerge from harnessing technology to the ends of intelligence collection was the U-2 program. In the mid- and late '50s, the U-2 was a unique aircraft in terms of its performance, the camera systems it carried and the superb information it collected.

For many reasons, the U-2 is no longer a useful intelligence collector. But as the U-2 began to lose its effectiveness, other systems came along to fill the gap.

The new systems have dramatically expanded the capabilities and applications of technical intelligence collection. Today, technical intelligence collection systems represent a large portion of the total national intelligence resources.

Another part of this national asset is its wealth of highly educated and gifted analysts. Collecting quality information is not the end of the intelligence process. There is a great difference between information and intelligence.

If I may, I would like to cite an example that many of you in this room understand all too well: Pearl Harbor. In the days before the Second World War, the United States had what could be called departmental intelligence. In other words, each department and agency had bits and pieces of information that they carefully controlled. In today's terminology, no one was "getting it together."